UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/552,932	04/20/2000	Ralph C. Taylor	0100.0000770	5713

7590 01/13/2004

Markison & Reckamp PC
115 Wild Basin Road Suite 107
Austin, TX 78746

EXAMINER	
NGUYEN, KIMBINH T	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2671	12

DATE MAILED: 01/13/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/552,932	TAYLOR ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Kimbinh T. Nguyen	2671	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *24 November 2003*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-30* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-30* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ .
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: .

DETAILED ACTION

REQUEST FOR CONTINUED EXAMINATION

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 11/24/03 has been entered.

2. Claims 1-30 are pending in the application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-3, 6-10, 21-23 and 26-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Morse et al. (6,359,630) in view of Fowler et al. (6,052,129).

Claim 1, Morse et al. discloses comparing (clip testing between the vertices of the geometric primitive against a clipping boundary) the X coordinates for the vertex (of a geometric primitive) with X clip values to determine an X clip code, wherein the X clip values correspond to the minimum (minus x plane) and maximum (plus or positive x plane) X values to include a horizontal discard clip guard band (x-plane) which is

defined as lying within the trivial accept guard band (trivial acceptance or acceptance refers to the determination that a geometric primitive lies wholly inside the viewport or guard band clipping boundary); comparing the Y coordinates with Y clip values to determine a Y clip code, wherein the Y clip values correspond to the minimum (minus y plane) and maximum Y values (positive y plane) to include a vertical discard clip guard band (y plane) which is defined as lying within the trivial accept guard band; comparing the Z coordinates with Z clip values to determine a Z clip code, wherein the Z clip values correspond to minimum (a minus z plane) and maximum Z values (a positive z plane) (see col. 10 line 45 through col. 12 line 54; figs. 4-6); determining if the primitive can be discarded based on the X clip code, the Y clip code, and the Z clip code (whether the geometric primitive should be trivially accepted, trivially rejected, or clipped, based on Boolean operations); when the primitive can be discarded (trivial rejected), discarding the primitive; and when the primitive cannot be discarded (trivial accepted), processing at least a portion of the primitive using a three-dimensional graphics pipeline (col. 15, lines 14-26). It is noted that performing clip testing, Morse does not teach using clip codes for the vertices; however, Fowler et al. shows a 2D example of how clip codes are assigned to different regions formed by the clip planes to determine a triangle can be trivially accepted or trivially rejected (col. 2, lines 13-23; fig. 4). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the Fowler's teaching into the Morse's method for utilizing the clip codes to perform primitive clipping, because trivial acceptance and trivial rejection are implemented by providing the rasterizer with the capability of

discarding "reject" triangles or of rendering "accept" triangles without modification, as necessary (col. 5, lines 56-59).

Claims 2, 3, 6-8, Morse et al. does not teach rasterizing of primitive; however, Fowler et al. discloses rasterizing at least a portion (pixel) of the primitive (col. 10, lines 20-34); the discard clip guard bands are based on a dimension of a rasterized area of the primitive (triangle) (col. 6, lines 7-20); the horizontal (z coordinate) and vertical (y coordinate) discard clip guard bands correspond to an amount of dimensional (guard band w value) expansion (infinitely large) used for processing primitives (pixels) (col. 8, lines 20-23); the dimensional expansion corresponds to anti aliasing operations performed on primitives having at least three vertices (triangle) (col. 6, line 28); the horizontal and vertical clip guard bands (fig. 9) correspond to dimensions corresponding to a predetermined number of pixels (pre-clipping clip code computation step) (col. 8, lines 20-26). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the Fowler's teaching into the Morse's method for utilization of guard band region about the periphery of the clip volume, because it would reduced the number of clipping operations (col. 6, lines 10-11).

Claim 9, the rationale provided in the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated herein. In addition, Morse et al. et al. discloses determining a trivial-accept X, Y and Z clip codes (clip testing for trivial acceptance of all 3 planes).

Claim 10, Morse et al. discloses the vertical accept clip guard band (guard band clipping boundary 314; fig. 4) is greater than the vertical discard guard band (regular

clipping boundary 312; fig. 4), and wherein the horizontal accept clip guard band is greater than the horizontal discard guard band (col. 11, lines 33-41).

Claim 21, the rationale provide in the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated here in. In addition, Morse et al. discloses a processing module (graphics accelerator 112); and memory operably coupled to the processing module (main memory 106; fig. 2).

Claims 22, 23 and 26-28, the rationale provided in the rejection of claims 2, 6, 7 and 8 is incorporated here in.

Claims 29 and 30, the rationale provided in the rejection of claims 9 and 10 are incorporated here in.

5. Claims 4, 5, 24 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Morse et al. (6,359,630) in view of Fowler et al. (6,052,129) and further in view of Callahan et al. (5,012,433).

Claim 4, Morse et al. does not teach primitive dimension; however, Callahan et al. discloses the primitive is a line and the dimension is ones half of a smaller dimension (actual viewing volume is smaller than a clipping volume or window) of the rasterized area of the line (col. 7, lines 8-25). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the Callahan's teaching into the Morse's method for enlarging the viewing volume (window) boundary, because it would improve transformation a line primitive to allow the wide line to be accurately and effectively rendered in the real viewport (col. 7, lines 49-51).

Claim 5, Morse et al. discloses various techniques have been developed for clipping having geometry primitive is a triangle (three vertices), a line (two vertices), a point (one vertex), but Morse does not teach a radial dimension of the rasterized area of the point; however, Callahan teaches multistage clipping on simpler representations of primitives (e.g. a line or a position and a radius for a circle) (col. 5, lines 8-32). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the Callahan's teaching into the Morse's method for analyzing geometry primitive, because when the primitive's size is a rendering attribute, the function used to obtain the clipping volume boundaries must take into account the zoom effects of the mapping process, since the point responds to zooming to obtain a radial circle (full circle) within the clipping window, this would improve multistage clipping method (col. 7, lines 44-45).

Claims 24 and 25, the rationale provide in the rejection of claims 4 and 5 is incorporated here in.

6. Claims 11-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Koss et al. 5,720,019) in view of Murphy (6,111,584).

Claim 11, Koss et al. discloses a clip code generator (clipping processor) that is operable to receive a clip-space primitive (coordinates for each vertex of a primitive to be clipped), wherein the clip code generator compares (clip compare register) coordinates for vertices of the clip-space primitive with screen space coordinates scaled by a discard clip guard band (clip region) to determine discard clip code (trivially rejected) for the clip-space primitive (col. 11, lines 61-66; col. 13, line 44 through col. 14,

line 20; col. 15, lines 26-27); an evaluation block operably (the clipping preprocessor) coupled to the clip code generator (clipping processor), wherein the evaluation block evaluates the discard clip codes to produce a discard decision included in control information, wherein the discard decision indicates whether the clip-space primitive can be discarded primitive (col. 2, lines 17-21); a clip processing block operably coupled to the evaluation block and operable to receive the clip-space primitive, wherein when the discard decision included in the control information indicates that the clip-space primitive can be discarded, the clip processing block discards the clip-space primitive, wherein when the clip-space primitive cannot be discarded, the clip processing block selectively performs clipping functions on the clip-space primitive based on the control information to produce a clipped primitive (col. 15, lines 6-20); and a three-dimensional graphics pipeline operably coupled to the clip processing block (fig. 1, processor 19 coupled to front end board 10, texture mapping board 12 and frame buffer 14 each is pipelined and operates on multiple simultaneously) (col. 4, lines 63-65); Koss does not teach pixel fragment data; however, Murphy discloses the three-dimensional graphics pipeline processes the clipped primitive to produce pixel fragment data (col. 4, lines 37-44). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the Murphy's teaching into Koss' method for utilizing pipelined processing, because fragment is the portion of a primitive which affects a single pixel, fragment will be eliminated in the pipeline, this would support trivially rejected or accepted to improve rendering a primitive using the primitive data (col. 83, lines 20-21).

Claim 12, 13, Koss does not teach a frame buffer; however, Murphy discloses a frame buffer operably coupled to the three-dimensional graphics pipeline, wherein the frame buffers stores pixel data (RGB, Alpha) corresponding to the screen space, wherein the three-dimensional graphics pipeline blends the pixel fragment data with the pixel data (col. 32, lines 55-67; col. 33, lines 35-37); the three-dimensional graphics pipeline includes a rasterization block, wherein processing the clipped primitive includes rasterizing the clipped primitive (col. 32, lines 56-67; col. 37, lines 12-13). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify feature pixel fragment blending of Murphy's teaching into primitive clipping method as taught by Koss, because it would improve rendering a primitive (col. 83, lines 20-21).

Claim 14, Koss et al. discloses a transform block operably (clip code bus) coupled to the clip code generator and the clip processing block, wherein the transform block is operable to receive an object-space primitive, wherein the transform block transforms the object-space primitive from object space to clip space to produce the clip-space primitive (col. 2, lines 46-51; col. 12, lines 30-32).

Claim 15, Koss et al. discloses the clip code generator (clipping processor) compares the coordinates for the vertices (col. 9, lines 17-37) with clip space coordinates of frustum clip planes (view volume) scaled by an accept clip guard band to determine accept clip codes for the clip-space primitive; wherein the evaluation block evaluates the accept clip codes to produce an accept decision include in the control information, wherein the accept decision indicates if the clip-space primitive is to be

processed without clipping; and wherein when the accept decision indicates that the clip-space primitive is to be processed without clipping, the clip processing block forwards the clip-space primitive as the clipped primitive without clipping the clip-space primitive (col. 13, lines 21-43).

7. Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Koss et al. 5,720,019) in view of Murphy (6,111,584) and further in view of Morse et al. (6,359,630).

Claim 16, Koss does not teach an accept clip guard band; however, Morse discloses the accept clip guard band (guard band clipping boundary 314; fig. 4) is greater than the discard clip guard band (regular clipping boundary 312; fig. 4). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the Morse's teaching into the Koss' method for utilizing the clip guard band, because using guard band it would improve clip testing refers to the operation of determining whether a geometric primitive is to be clipped or not clipped for the purpose of reducing number of primitives which are rendered.

8. Claims 17-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Koss et al. 5,720,019) in view of Murphy (6,111,584) and further in view of Fowler et al. (6,052,129).

Claim 17, Koss does not teach discard clip guard band; however, Fowler et al. discloses the discard clip guard bands are based on a dimension of a rasterized area of the primitive (triangle) (col. 6, lines 7-20). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the Fowler's teaching

into the Koss' method for rasterizing primitive, because using of guard band requires that the rasterizer can handle vertex coordinates that fall outside of the actual clip region (trivial reject) and it would reduce the number of clipping operations (col. 6, lines 10-12).

Claims 18 and 19, the rationale provided in the rejection of claims 4 and 5 are applicable hereto.

Claim 20, the rationale provided in the rejection of claim 8 is incorporated here in.

Response to Arguments

9. With respect to Applicant's arguments, the rejections of claims 1-20 have been modified in this Office action.

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **Kimbinh Nguyen** whose telephone number is **(703) 305-9683**. The examiner can normally be reached **(Monday- Thursday from 7:00 AM to 4:30 PM and alternate Fridays from 7:00 AM to 3:30 PM)**.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mark Zimmerman, can be reached at (703) 305-9798.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

Or faxed to:

(703) 872-9314 (for Technology Center 2600 only)

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Part II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA, Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Technology Center 2600 Customer Service Office whose telephone number is (703) 306-0377.

January 8, 2004

Kimbinh Nguyen

Patent Examiner AU 2671